AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 has been replaced by an amended replacement drawing of Figure 1. A replacement sheet of drawings is attached as an Appendix. In Fig. 1, a legend has been provided corresponding to the reference numerals used.

Attachment:
          Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are all the claims originally pending in the application. Claim 6 is being amended, claim 10 is being canceled and claim 11 is being added.

I.   Drawings

The Examiner objected to Figure 1 of the drawings for not showing proper label names within the elements, since the elements contain reference numerals instead of the label names. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out the issue and herein submits a replacement Figure 1 with a legend corresponding to the reference numerals used, in order to properly show the label names the elements are referring to.

II.   Specification

The Examiner suggested the use of appropriate section headings in the application specification. The Applicant therefore has added appropriate section headings by amendment above.

III. Claim Amendments

The Applicant is amending claims 1-10 to correct various typographical and grammatical errors. In claim 6, the Applicant is replacing the word "further trigger-*part*" with "further

trigger-*packet*," to conform with the language used in the previous claim 5 and in the

specification. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification on page 9, third

paragraph.

Finally, the Applicant has also canceled claim 10 and added claim 11 to more clearly

state a method of one aspect of the present invention.

IV.   Claim Rejections: 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 USC §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated

by Cave et al. (US 2001/0005372 A1) (hereinafter "Cave"). The Applicant has reviewed the

Examiner's arguments and the prior art, but respectfully disagrees.

<u>Claim 1</u>

The Examiner states that Cave shows all of the elements of claim 1, including a

system…characterized in that said network comprises a storage-station for storing information to

be supplied during said call to said second terminal in the form of at least one data-packet via the

Internet Protocol (Figure 11; VRU 800; Par. 0125).

The Applicant submits that Cave fails to disclose a network with "a storage-station for

storing information *to be supplied during said call to said second terminal…*" (emphasis added).

The Examiner refers to Figure 11 and paragraph [0125] of Cave, specifically the VRU 800, as

equivalent to a storage-station of the invention embodied by claim 1. However, Cave does not

disclose that the VRU 800 stores information to be supplied *to a second terminal* and *during a*

call to a second terminal. Instead, paragraph [0125] of Cave discloses how the VRU 800 can

record a phone call between two terminals, information that is not delivered to the second

terminal but stored on network terminals. The presence of the network terminals further

illustrates that the VRU 800 is not actually a storage-station but simply a router which processes

requests and routes information to different devices. Since Cave does not disclose how the VRU

800 can send information to a second terminal during a call, Cave cannot be said to disclose the

particular elements of claim 1 of the present invention.

In further contrast to Cave, the storage-station can, in one embodiment, transmit a picture

or an image from the storage-station to the second terminal *during a VoIP call* (specification,

page 2, paragraphs 2 and 4). The invention disclosed in Cave, however, does not provide for the

VRU or a storage-station to provide anything to the second terminal during a call. Therefore,

Cave does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, and does not anticipate the

embodiment of the invention as set forth in claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §102(b) be

withdrawn.

Claims 2-3

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above for claim 1, and

submits that claims 2 and 3 are allowable at least based on their dependency to claim 1.

Claim 4

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above for claim 1, and

submits that claim 4 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 3 and thereby claim 1.

The Applicant also argues that Cave does not disclose information comprised of information-

parts, such that the trigger-packet comprises an indication for selecting at least one information-

part to be supplied during said call to said second terminal (2). The Examiner refers to paragraph

[0125] and Fig. 4a of Cave, but neither cited sections disclose an information-part being supplied

during a call to a second terminal, nor does it disclose how the trigger-packet provides an

indication of which information-part to supply.

Claim 5

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above for claim 1, and

submits that claim 5 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 1. Furthermore, the

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that Cave discloses the elements of claim 5, specifically

with regard to the sending of a trigger-packet from a first terminal to a second terminal, with the

second terminal in response to the trigger-packet generating a further trigger-packet that is sent,

during a call, to the storage-station. The Examiner cites to Fig. 10 of Cave to show a bi-

directional path between the two gateways adjacent to the first and second terminals, and to Fig.

4c to show bi-directional paths 820 and 828 between the gateways and VRU 800. However,

Cave fails to disclose, either generally or specifically, a system as described in claim 5 of the

present invention, whereby a trigger-packet is configured to be sent from the first terminal to the

second terminal, subsequently generating a further trigger-packet that is sent, during the call, to

the storage-station. As Cave does not disclose each and every element of claim 5, Cave cannot anticipate the claim under 35 USC §102(b).

Claim 6

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above for claim 1 and claim 5, and submits that claim 6 is allowable at least based on its dependency to claim 5 and thereby claim 1.

Claims 7-9

The Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments presented above for claim 1, and submits that claims 7-9 are allowable for at least the same reasons stated therein.

Claims 10-11

The Applicant herein cancels claim 10 and submits new claim 11 to cover one aspect of a method according to the invention. For the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, the Applicant believes that claim 11 is allowable over the cited art.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   _____
Telephone: (650) 625-8100   Scott H. Davison
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110   Registration No. 52,800

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 17, 2007